# MITRE

**James J. Croke**
Vice President
Bedford Operations
617-271-3132

7 January 1985
D11-123

C. D. May, Jr.

Dear Danny:

Your first draft of the "CIA Computer Study Panel Report" dated 20 December 1984 seemed to cover all of the major points of view expressed at the meetings we have had to date.

As you suggested in your cover letter, there is a need for a better organization of the material. I assume someone has already taken on that chore. I have enclosed a marked up copy to help identify certain specific changes needed. This is not a "line-in line-out" set of corrections, since I believe only one person can really focus on the necessary reorganization of the report. I do have some strong biases about the priorities which should be assigned to the issues our panel discussed, and these do relate to the structure of the final report. Since this is such a complex subject, I thought maybe the best way to submit my prejudices would be to take advantage of your offer and attempt to write an executive summary. This is attached for your consideration.

I hope this review of your initial draft report is worthwhile. Please call if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Jim

cc:

STAT

The MITRE Corporation
Burlington Road
Bedford, Massachusetts 01730

James J. Croke
7 January 1984

# Computer Study Panel Report

## Executive Summary

A panel, convened at the direction of the CIA Deputy Director for Administration, has been studying options for the Agency central computer systems which would allow the anticipated growth in capabilities but not at the expense of displacing additional personnel from the Headquarters building. The panel's deliberation to date has been based on briefings and handouts provided by Agency activities, primarily ODP planning information. None of these plans' basic assumptions have been challenged. The major options addressed in this study report are, therefore, limited to the premise that ODP growth projections are reasonable.

The strong feeling of the panel is that new architectural options for computer systems should be analyzed in detail. Reallocation of floorspace to more ADP equipment which is organized along the lines of the ODP "new systems architecture" is not the answer. This architecture is particularly limiting in its ability to contain space growth and take maximum advantage of new technologies.

Several management actions are discussed which might be used to curtail system growth. The conclusion of the panel is that the basic approach to providing users with unhampered access to automation support should be continued, rather than instituting arbitrary "charge-back schemes" or involving users with the fiscal aspects of system acquisition. However, some visibility into resource usage should be considered, and users should be made more aware of the resource implications of their system usage.

The panel recommends that a modeling effort be undertaken, not only to investigate impact on people and machines of various floorspace allocations, but to model viable system alternatives. This includes heavy emphasis on the communications required to support various

partitioning of services, for instance the minimization of communications dependencies from one user group to another, and identification of common services which could benefit from centralization. The emergence of appropriate networking and workstation technologies must be addressed. The security requirements need to be articulated and factored into design alternatives.

Finally, a new building designed for computer systems should be built for the Agency. Two factors were identified by the panel which lead to the conclusion that an appropriate, expandable, off-campus building will be required after 1992. The first is the absolute requirement for survivability. The second is the Agency responsibility to house other Community systems; this factor is less controllable by Agency policy, but is anticipated to be a continuing and dramatic growth area. The technologies have become available to support various new architectures to take advantage of this new building and the transition of systems to effectively support user needs in that environment. Further study, including the architectural modeling already cited, is recommended. Several alternatives, ranging from storage hierarchy realignment to evolution of PBX/Workstation environments, are identified in this report.